James L. Nicholson, Jr., CPA G. Kenneth Pavy, II, CPA Michael A. Roy, CPA Lisa Trouille Manuel, CPA Dana D. Quebedeaux, CPA

Van L. Auld, CPA



JOHN S. DOWLING & COMPANY
A CORPORATION OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

www.jsdc-cpas.com

SYSTEM REVIEW REPORT

John S. Dowling, CPA 1904-1984 John Newton Stout, CPA 1936-2005 Chizal S. Fontenot, CPA 1955-2012

Retired

Harold Dupre, CPA 1996 Dwight Ledoux, CPA 1998 Joel Lanclos, Jr., CPA 2003 Russell J. Stelly, CPA 2005

February 4, 2016

To the Partners

Marcus, Robinson and Hassell and the Peer Review Committee of the Louisiana Society
of CPA's

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of Marcus, Robinson and Hassell (the firm) in effect for the year ended September 30, 2015. Our peer review was conducted in accordance with the Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews established by the Peer Review Board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. As part of our peer review, we considered reviews by regulatory entities, if applicable, in determining the nature and extent of our procedures. The firm is responsible for designing a system of quality control and complying with it to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of performing and reporting in conformity with applicable professional standards in all material respects. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system of quality control and the firm's compliance therewith based on our review. The nature, objectives, scope, limitations of, and the procedures performed in a System Review are described in the standards at www.aicpa.org/prsummary.

As required by the standards, engagements selected for review included engagements performed under the Government Auditing Standards.

We noted the following deficiency during our review:

1. Deficiency – The firm's policies and procedures require the use of the reference materials contained in its reference library in the preparation and review of engagements. The firm failed to properly utilize these materials in conducting a first time single audit engagement and as a result incorrectly reported the entity as a low risk auditee and also, the firm's documentation and tests of internal controls over compliance failed to address all material compliance requirements of the major program and its documentation did not incorporate each of the five internal control components. The incorrect assessment as a low risk auditee is a repeat comment. Due to the nature of the engagement (only one federal program), the issue does not create a material deficiency because 100% of federal programs were tested.

To the Partners
Marcus, Robinson and Hassell and the Peer Review Committee of the Louisiana Society
of CPA's
Page 2

<u>Recommendation</u> — We recommend that the firm implement more stringent procedures to ensure that all appropriate reference materials are fully and completely utilized in the performance and review of engagements. The firm may also wish to consider additional CPE in the area of single audits.

In our opinion, except for the deficiency previously described, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of Marcus, Robinson and Hassell in effect for the year ended September 30, 2015, has been suitably designed and complied with to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of performing and reporting in conformity with applicable professional standards in all material respects. Firms can receive a rating of pass, pass with deficiency(ies) or fail. Marcus, Robinson and Hassell has received a peer review rating of pass with deficiency.

John S Dowling & Company

Stowing + Company





March 17, 2016

John S Robinson Marcus, Robinson and Hassell, CPAs 613 N 5th St Monroe, LA 71201

Dear Mr. Robinson:

On March 17, 2016 the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee accepted the report on the most recent system peer review of your firm and your firm's response thereto.

The Committee accepted the aforementioned documents with the understanding that the firm will:

- ensure that all professional staff responsible for planning or performing engagements participate in at least 16 hours of continuing professional education in the area of single audit review no later than July 31, 2016. Please send a letter to the Committee detailing the courses taken by each individual within thirty days of that date, along with proof of attendance at the courses. Self study, teleconferences or webcasts will not satisfy this requirement. If you have taken CPE in this or similar areas in the previous six months, please contact the peer review department to determine if the course qualifies.
- permit an outside party, acceptable to the Committee chair, to review the report, financial statements, and working papers on the next single audit engagement subsequent to the review PRIOR to release. The outside party should report to the Committee by July 31, 2016 on the results of the review. You must obtain the services of the outside party at your expense and ensure they are acceptable to the committee by contacting the Peer Review Department. Upon completion of the pre issuance review, the reviewer will be required to issue a letter of corrective action to the committee. The committee will review the letter along with any workpapers prepared during the preissuance review and determine if further action will be required. If you do not expect to have an engagement completed in time to meet the deadline, please contact the Peer Review Department with an expected date.

This review is not considered accepted until we receive the signed document.

State Board Rules provide that timely completion of a peer review of firms that have performed attest services (e.g., compilations, reviews, audits, agreed upon procedures, etc.) is required in order to maintain and renew a CPA firm permit to practice.

As defined in Interpretation 25-2 of the Standards the review will not be considered complete until the committee accepts the report and letter of response (if applicable) or decides that the reviewed firm has performed the agreed-to corrective action(s) to the committee's satisfaction and the committee requires no additional corrective action(s) by the reviewed firm. This date is noted in a final letter from the administering entity to the reviewed firm and is posted on the State Board secure website

Letter ID: 1064328A

Your firm's agreement to take this action voluntarily demonstrates its commitment to the objectives of the profession's practice-monitoring programs. Please acknowledge that agreement by returning a signed copy of this letter to us via email gsnyder@lcpa.org or fax 985-764-4345.

Sincerely, SOCIETY OF LOUISIANA CPAs

Stacey Lockwood

Director of Professional Oversight slockwood@lcpa.org 504 904-1136

cc: George Kenneth Pavy

Firm Number: 10096314

Review Number: 404756

Acknowledged for the Firm:

Signature:

Letter ID: 1064328A





April 27, 2016

John S Robinson Marcus, Robinson and Hassell, CPAs 613 N 5Th St Monroe, LA 71201

Dear Mr. Robinson:

On April 27, 2016 the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee determined that your most recent peer review is complete.

The due date for your next review is March 31, 2019. This is the date by which all review documents should be completed and submitted to the administering entity. Since your firm's due date is between January and April, you may arrange to have your review a few months earlier to avoid having a review during tax season.

Sincerely, SOCIETY OF LOUISIANA CPAs

Stacey Lockwood

Director of Professional Oversight slockwood@lcpa.org 504 904-1136

cc: George Kenneth Pavy

Firm No. 10096314

Review No. 404756

Letter ID: 1071141A